International Journal of Science and Business 2024, 42(1), 212-227
ISSN: 2520-4750 (Online) 2521-3040 (Print)
Journal: ijsab.com/ijsb

Examining the Role of Corporate Governance Practices in Enhancing Stakeholder Trust: Insights from Global Case Studies

Md. Ridoy Hasan [1] *, Imran Hossain [2], & Md. Hafizul Islam [3]

[1] Lecturer, Department of Business Administration, Bangladesh Army University of Science and Technology, Saidpur 5310, Bangladesh.
[2] Lecturer, Department of Business Administration, Rabindra Maitree University, Kushtia, Bangladesh.
[3] Lecturer, Department of Accounting & Information Systems, Bangladesh Army University of Science and Technology, Saidpur 5310, Bangladesh.
* Corresponding author: Md. Ridoy Hasan (mdridoyhasan975@gmail.com)

Abstract
Corporate governance practices are fundamental in promoting transparency, accountability and trust among key stakeholders leading to the long-term sustainable performance of organizations. This study investigates the effects of corporate governance in strengthening stakeholder confidence insights from global case studies. Incorporating analysis of the board of directors, executive compensation and shareholder activism as primary mechanisms of corporate governance, it examines their effects on trust-building. This is followed by discussion of its theoretical foundations and historical evolution. An exploration of selected case studies from different regions of the world, demonstrating positive practices and challenges in establishing stable governance frameworks. This suggests that corporate governance mechanisms should be designed in a manner where more than just shareholders are being considered, including employees, customers and regulators so as to allow for trust and legitimacy towards organizations over the long-term. The study offers practitioners and policymakers concrete guidelines while identifying prospects for future research in an ever-evolving domain of corporate governance.

Keywords: *Corporate Governance, Stakeholder Trust, Accountability, Transparency, Case Studies.*

ARTICLE INFO
Case Study
Received: 15 October 2024
Accepted: 30 November 2024
Published: 01 December 2024
DOI: 10.58970/IJSB.2493

CITATION
Hasan, M. R., Hossain, I., & Islam, M. H. (2024). Examining the Role of Corporate Governance Practices in Enhancing Stakeholder Trust: Insights from Global Case Studies, *International Journal of Science and Business*, 42(1), 212-227.

1. Introduction

Corporate governance is a cornerstone of sustainable and responsible organizational management, encompassing a framework of laws, practices, and processes designed to align the interests of diverse stakeholders, including shareholders, employees, customers, and regulatory bodies (Claessens & Yurtoglu, 2013). Over the years, the significance of corporate governance has grown, particularly in the wake of corporate scandals such as Enron and the Volkswagen emissions scandal, which revealed the catastrophic consequences of weak governance practices (Aguilera et al., 2015). Beyond mitigating risks, effective governance systems play a pivotal role in fostering trust among stakeholders and ensuring long-term organizational sustainability.

Stakeholder trust—the belief that an organization acts fairly, competently, and ethically—has emerged as a critical determinant of corporate success. It enables the establishment of collaborative relationships while mitigating risks associated with conflicts of interest (Pirson et al., 2016). Research highlights that governance mechanisms such as the composition of the board of directors, executive compensation policies, and shareholder activism are essential tools for enhancing transparency and accountability (Bhagat & Bolton, 2019). When effectively implemented, these mechanisms not only safeguard against financial mismanagement but also fulfill an organization's ethical obligations to its stakeholders. Recent studies further reinforce the importance of corporate governance in strengthening stakeholder trust. For example, the integration of stakeholder-centric governance frameworks has been shown to enhance organizational legitimacy and resilience during crises (Freeman et al., 2020). Moreover, advancements in governance practices, such as the adoption of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria, have demonstrated the potential to align corporate objectives with broader societal values, fostering greater trust and engagement (Eccles et al., 2020).

Global case studies provide valuable insights into the interplay between corporate governance and stakeholder trust across different jurisdictions. For instance, the restructuring of governance frameworks in emerging economies like India and South Africa highlights the challenges and opportunities associated with balancing traditional shareholder-centric models with inclusive stakeholder approaches (Chapple et al., 2019). Additionally, comparative analyses of governance practices in developed markets, such as the United States and Germany, reveal how regulatory reforms and cultural factors influence the effectiveness of governance mechanisms in building stakeholder trust (Kim et al., 2021). This study examines the relationship between corporate governance and stakeholder trust through a theoretical exploration of governance mechanisms, their historical evolution, and practical implications. By analyzing global case studies, it aims to identify best practices and challenges in governance frameworks, offering actionable insights for policymakers and practitioners. Furthermore, it contributes to the ongoing academic debate by emphasizing the need for governance systems that prioritize stakeholder inclusivity and long-term sustainability.

2. Problem and justification

With business operations rapidly becoming interconnected and transparent, improved corporate governance is essential for restoring confidence among stakeholders. Organizations are under growing pressure from stakeholders to contain governance that reinforces accountability, transparency, and responsible behavior. The real challenge is creating governance which aligns with what the organization seeks to achieve and what all stakeholders expect. While this section will explore the findings of stakeholder trust crisis and why there is a need for proper corporate governance, it will do so by contribute insight from literature.

2.1 Literature Review

Scholars have extensively highlighted the pivotal role of corporate governance in fostering stakeholder trust, positing that governance premiums are critical for organizational stability and performance. Stakeholder trust has been identified as a vital component for mitigating risks, accessing capital, and maintaining long-term relationships with key stakeholders (Pirson et al., 2016). Core governance mechanisms, such as board independence and executive accountability, are widely recognized as fundamental to enhancing stakeholder trust (Bhagat & Bolton, 2019).
Historical evidence of corporate governance failures underscores the reactive nature of reforms. Events such as the Enron scandal in 2001 led to regulatory overhauls like the Sarbanes–Oxley Act, which aimed to enforce corporate accountability (Aguilera et al., 2015). Similar patterns have emerged globally, with both developed and emerging economies introducing reforms to rectify structural inefficiencies and restore investor confidence (Claessens & Yurtoglu, 2013). For example, governance reforms in the United Kingdom post the Cadbury Report and in India following the Satyam scandal reflect the ongoing global efforts to bolster governance frameworks

(Banerjee et al., 2020). However, despite these advances, the alignment of governance practices with diverse stakeholder interests remains an ongoing challenge, especially in culturally and institutionally varied contexts. In developing economies, weak legal frameworks and limited law enforcement capabilities exacerbate governance inefficiencies (Fan et al., 2011). For instance, research highlights the challenges faced by African nations in implementing effective corporate governance due to corruption and lack of institutional support (Abor & Fiador, 2020). This underscores the necessity for further scholarship to identify governance mechanisms resilient to such contextual barriers.

Shareholder activism has also emerged as a key driver of governance changes in recent years. Activist investors increasingly advocate for corporate commitments to sustainability and climate change, signaling a shift towards stakeholder-oriented governance models (McKinsey, 2019). Such governance shifts align with the growing emphasis on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) principles, which are seen as instrumental in enhancing organizational legitimacy and trust (Eccles et al., 2020). However, balancing shareholder primacy with broader stakeholder interests continues to pose significant challenges, particularly in jurisdictions where shareholder primacy remains deeply entrenched (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003; Freeman et al., 2020). Emerging research also explores the intersection of governance and technology, with studies showing how digital tools enhance transparency and accountability (Wamba et al., 2021). For example, blockchain applications in corporate governance have demonstrated potential in improving accountability in supply chain management and financial reporting (Bhimani et al., 2021). Similarly, the integration of artificial intelligence in governance practices offers new avenues for monitoring and risk mitigation, further reinforcing stakeholder trust (Schoeman & Sandrock, 2022). This study builds on these insights by examining global case studies to illustrate how diverse governance practices influence stakeholder trust. By addressing the complexities of modern governance, this research aims to provide actionable frameworks for organizations seeking to align governance mechanisms with stakeholder expectations, fostering trust and performance in an increasingly dynamic environment.

3. Objectives of the study

This study aims to investigate the link between corporate governance and stakeholder trust using global level case studies. The new direction seeks to explore how different corporate governance mechanisms influence the trust regarding organizations by various stakeholders. Which includes tracing the main governance mechanisms, including board independence, executive compensation and shareholder activism driving your stakeholder trust build up continue to sustain over time. A second aim is to compare the performance of various corporate governance modalities in diverse institutional settings. The goal of this study is not only to investigate the functioning of governance mechanisms in developed and emerging markets but also to compare their successfulness, and also bring out similarities and differences as crucial characteristics between developing countries and different circumstances. The understanding of factors affecting stakeholder trust is also integral to the study as the research would investigate how external and internal factors, such as transparency, accountability, and ethical conduct shape stakeholder perceptions. Finally, the article strives to offer practical recommendations for corporations that want to improve their governance process by accelerating the construction of better relationships with stakeholders. This involves suggesting practical measures that the policymakers might consider for reinforcing corporate governance structures at national and international levels. Moreover, the research also looks at limitations and challenges that restrict organizations from implementing corporate governance reforms, how regulatory hurdles and cultural factors are hampering corporate governance, the barriers to effective governance in developed as well as emerging markets. The last part of the study will indicate some gaps in corporate governance and stakeholder trust, listing some frameworks for future research. The recommendations we provide are intended to encourage more evidence-based exploration of the association between governance practices and stakeholder trust, ultimately facilitating a more holistic view on how corporate governance can be utilized for establishing long-term stakeholder relationships.

4. Methodology

The present study clearly has qualitative research methodology with the situation covering secondary data and exploring if corporate governance contributes to strong confidence among stakeholders. The design of the study is based on analysis of a cross section of best practices from organizations around the world with robust governance or which have subsequently faced issues with stakeholder trust. Case studies have been chosen based on presence of solid governance structures, significant governance reforms, or situations where stakeholder trust greatly impacted outcomes. The data is collected from peer reviewed contributions, business publications, and credible sources that outline corporate governance frameworks and practices. Such an approach enables an examination of the effects of governance mechanisms, such as board composition, executive pay and shareholder activism on stakeholder trust in different organizational contexts. The findings will provide practical direction for both improving corporate governance practices, and analyzing common themes, issues, success stories across markets.

5. Theoretical Foundations of Corporate Governance

5.1 Definition and Concept of Corporate Governance

Corporate governance is the system of rules, practices and processes by which a company is directed and controlled. It defines the relationships between management, its board of directors, shareholders and other stakeholders in a company. Corporate governance is a set of governing mechanisms that hold corporations accountable to their stakeholders (OECD, 2015) with a goal of upholding transparency, equity and accountability in decision making. The fundamental principle behind the concept of corporate governance is that it mediates between the interest of diverse stakeholders (shareholders, employees, customers and society at large) towards improving organizational performance and sustainability (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997).

5.2 Historical Development of Corporate Governance

Corporate governance has evolved intimately with the business corporation and the complex processes through which capital is provided to growing global financial markets. Fundamentally, the earliest governance functionality focused on owners and managers due to the fact clearly, they be aware of relationship quality, economic performance and shareholder value. Despite these success stories, high-profile corporate scandals such as the Enron collapse in the early 2000s revealed widespread deficiencies in governance practices at all levels, resulting in substantial reforms designed to enhance accountability and transparency (Aguilera et al., 2015). These scandals led directly to the introduction of regulations, including the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 in the USA and the UK Corporate Governance Code in 2003, which epitomize this trend focusing on independent boards and executive pay transparency at both board and top management levels as well as enhanced shareholder rights (Mallin, 2019). In more recent years, the focus of corporate governance frameworks has broadened to encompass ESG concerns (Gillan, 2006), which is consistent with the increasing significance of corporate responsibility and sustainability over time.

5.3 Theoretical Frameworks in Corporate Governance

Various theoretical models emerged to conceptualize the nature of corporate Governance. The Agency Theory is one of the most powerful and is related to principal-agent problem (principals meaning here shareholders, agents meaning managers). At play is the principal-agent problem of self-interested managers vs owners (Greckhamer et al. 2017; Jensen & Meckling, 1976) Under this theory, governance mechanisms (such as executive pay, performance measures and board monitoring) are very important to the solution of this agency problem because they attempt to better align manager interests with shareholder interests.

The other important theory taught in the course is the Stewardship Theory which believes agency theory makes excessive presumptions of self-interested conduct and maintains that if incentives and directions are aligned properly, managements will seek to do a good job as stewards. According to Davis et al. (1997) are more motivated and moved by trust, commitment and success of the organization as a whole rather than financial securities. It urges boards to trust management more and suggests changing governance practices so that organizational performance is measured on a long-term basis. An alternative view is found in Stakeholder Theory — by Freeman (1984) which argues that governance should be broader than shareholders, and include the interests of all stakeholders. It widens the governance perspective up to align with employees, customers, suppliers and society and implies that organizations should seek an equilibrium of the interests of all parties involved as a sustainable outcome. The emergence of Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Factors in governance debates is linked with the rise of stakeholder theory as a major doctrine of corporate law theory response to rising pressures on firms for social responsibility and sustainability (Edmans, 2020). Corporate governance is a changing concept and is able to be interpreted through theory — it can also make for better performance, trust, long-run sustainability of organizations. Agency, stewardship and stakeholder theories exist in complementary dichotomies in terms of governance, all theorizing distinct aspects of how organizations can align their interests with the goals of its stakeholders.

6. Corporate Governance Mechanisms

6.1 Board of Directors

The board of directors is arguably the most important part of corporate governance; it serves as an interface between shareholders and management, guiding the strategic direction of a company while holding management responsible for company performance. Chartered accountants as board directors are vital protectors of stakeholder interests and trust. The proportion of independent directors on the board matters quite a bit when it comes to its effectiveness (Fama & Jensen, 1983). Independent directors, on the other hand, are assumed to have a greater ability to make unconflicted decisions; hence they play an important role in mitigating agency problem and ensure that management does operate in the interests of shareholders (Zahra & Pearce, 1989). Recent literature focuses on the increasing importance of diversity and specifically female representation on boards, improving decision quality and corporate results (Adams & Ferreira, 2009; Post & Byron, 2015). Moreover, the board oversees executive compensation, risk management practices and strategic decisions, making sure these are aligned with shareholder and stakeholder interests. Previous studies have shown that active boards are associated with better financial performance and higher stakeholder confidence (Carter et al., 2010). In addition, boards are increasingly called upon to consider social and environmental matters such as corporate social responsibility (CSR), sustainability practices that build stakeholder trust (consumers, investors) (Eccles et al., 2014).

6.2 Executive Compensation

The other extremely important mechanism found in corporate governance is executive compensation. It holds executives accountable and incentivizes them to act in the best interests of shareholders and other stakeholders. Yet extravagant or poorly designed CEO compensation arrangements have been criticized and can give rise to controversies, especially when the link between pay and performance is tenuous (Bebchuk & Fried 2004). A good executive compensation package needs to provide an incentive for short-term results but also consider long-term value so that the company does not get short-changed in either case. The trend toward performance-based pay, which sets executive pay in relation to concrete financial or non-financial results, has been an increasingly studied topic (Kaplan, 2013). Link between executive compensation and non-financial performance indicators (e.g., CSR objectives and ESG targets) is an ongoing development. These factors are increasingly seen as critical to increasing long-term corporate value and for maintaining the trust of stakeholders (Cordeiro et al., 2020).

Consequently, compensation approaches are changing to reward executives for factoring in broader stakeholder interests (Kochhar1997).

6.3 Shareholder Activism

In this context, shareholder activism has become an important tool of corporate governance in which investors seek to participate in the affairs of corporations that will have an impact on company policy and governance practices. Activist shareholders are those who utilize their ownership positions to promote changes (in the form of shareholder proposals) in corporate governance structures, management practices, and financial strategies that they believe will increase shareholder value (Karpoff 2001). Shareholder activism can be exercised in different ways such as proxy battles, public campaigns, governance reforms proposals (Gillan & Starks, 2000). In the past few decades, the emergence of institutional investors (e.g., pension funds or hedge funds) was associated with strengthening shareholder activism in particular large public corporations (Aguilera et al., 2015). Such shareholders frequently demand tweaks to pay structures, the makeup of the boardroom and, occasionally, strategic direction. The increasing pressure from activist investors has caused firms to implement more stringent governance policies that are closer aligned with both shareholder and constituency (Bebchuk et al., 2015). On the other hand, shareholder activism is a controversial activity. It can trigger reforms in governance and financial performance, but also bring about conflicts of interest when activist investors focus on short-term financial goals at the expense of long-term sustainability (Bebchuk, 2007). In summary, shareholder activism is a key contributor to the enhancement of corporate governance as it motivates corporations to place greater emphasis on shareholder value and align with governance principles that bolster transparency, accountability and stakeholder confidence in management.

7. Stakeholder Trust in Corporate Governance

7.1 Definition and Importance of Stakeholder Trust

Stakeholder trust is the common denominator of corporate governance which have an impact on general relation of a company and its stakeholders (shareholders, employees, customers, suppliers and community). Trust in a corporation isn't just about profits but rather, its conduct in the role it plays to act responsibly, meet commitments and behave ethically and transparently. One of the primary drivers behind long-term positive outcomes for a company is when its stakeholder trusts it: investors, employees and consumers will be more likely to act positively towards a company when they have gained trust in it (Freeman 1984). Trust is a bridge in corporate governance by strengthen the cooperation, improve the corporate reputation and increase stakeholder loyalty. With renewed stakeholder scrutiny, be it by the public or regulators and investors, earning stakeholders' trust is paramount so that governance practices are viewed as rightful and even beneficial for multiple stakeholders. When companies exhibit high moral standards and transparency in decision-making, especially with respect to executive pay, environmental practices, and financial reporting — stakeholders are more willing to support them (Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2017). Previous research indicates that responsibility mechanisms of corporate governance, including board independence and shareholder rights, along with strong ethical codes of conduct greatly assist with the building and maintenance of stakeholder trust (Mishra & Nielsen 2000). This confidence is vital not only to keeping a core base of investors stable but also to improving the firm’s capacity at drawing actual people — talent, suppliers looking for positive relationships, and consumers looking for something they can trust.

7.2 Factors Influencing Stakeholder Trust

There are a few factors that determine the stakeholder trust in the corporate governance practices. Among these is transparency in decision-making. Stakeholders can have easy access to correct and real-time information about the financial status, governance of the company, and decision making when transparent practices are ensured. When stakeholders feel that they are able to obtain relevant information, they have a higher level of trust in the management and believe that the company conducts itself in an accountable manner (Healy & Palepu, 2001). The next one is accountability. Trust relationships are also more likely to develop in companies whose managements are held accountable to both shareholders and other stakeholders. That means defining performance metrics for executives, creating clear lines of accountability, and dealing with any stakeholder-unfriendly behavior quickly. Organizations that want to seem more honest are preferred when stakeholders come to know that the organizations admit their mistakes and fix them, instead of hiding or escaping from responsibility (Kaptein 2011). On the other side, ethical leadership also becomes an important component that contributes to influencing stakeholders' impressions regarding a company without integrity. Ethical leadership is a process that involves influences to promote the dignity and welfare of others; it entails commitment to fairness, respect for stakeholders, prioritizing societal and environmental sustainability in ways that balance long- and short-term benefits. According to (Brown & Treviño, 2006), demonstrating high ethical standards can facilitate trust among stakeholders, who are more likely to maintain their engagement with the organization. The company's practice of social responsibility is another major factor that affects the trust of all its stakeholders. Stakeholders are increasingly expecting companies to focus not only on financial data but also on social and environmental issues, including sustainability, human rights, and the right to a safe job. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is perhaps the best example of this concept, and stakeholders tend to view companies that stress CSR more favorably due in part to their concern for society as a whole, or at least branded this way (Carroll, 1999). To summarize, the role capacity of corporate governance systems is balanced by trust. It can be developed through transparency, accountability, ethical leadership, and commitment to social responsibility. When trust is created, organization have better grounds to nurture cohesive bond with their stakeholders leading to higher fiscal performance, operational ecosystems and sustainability.

7.3 Integration with Case Studies

The case studies of Enron and Volkswagen exemplify the critical role of stakeholder trust in corporate governance. Enron's collapse highlighted the devastating impact of a lack of transparency and accountability. The executives' unethical practices and the board's failure to exercise oversight eroded stakeholder confidence, leading to the company's demise. The scandal underscores the necessity of fostering trust through transparent financial reporting, independent board oversight, and ethical leadership. The regulatory response, including the enactment of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, reflects an effort to restore trust in corporate governance mechanisms by addressing systemic weaknesses exposed by Enron (Coates, 2007). Similarly, the Volkswagen emissions scandal demonstrated how breaches of trust can tarnish a company's reputation and financial stability. The deliberate manipulation of emissions data betrayed the trust of regulators, consumers, and investors. However, Volkswagen's subsequent reforms, including restructuring its board and investing in sustainability initiatives, illustrate the potential for companies to rebuild trust through accountability and CSR efforts. These actions align with broader themes of stakeholder trust and sustainability, demonstrating that ethical governance can mitigate damage and foster resilience in the aftermath of a crisis (Jung & Sharon, 2017). Both cases reinforce the broader theme that stakeholder trust is integral to sustainability in corporate governance. Companies that uphold transparency, accountability, and social responsibility are better positioned to cultivate long-term relationships with stakeholders, enabling them to navigate challenges, enhance operational ecosystems, and achieve sustainable growth.

8. Case Studies on Corporate Governance Practices

Corporate governance practices are vital to influence the transparency, accountability, and overall performance of organizations. Studying practical case studies could enable an individual to understand better how corporate governance schemes are implemented and contribute towards stakeholders' confidence and organizational outcomes. It discusses important examples of both effective and ineffective corporate governance in different sectors. However, and maybe more importantly — these case studies are rich in lessons about how different governance structures can shape organizational integrity, stakeholder relationships, and ultimately long-term success.

Case Study 1: The Enron Scandal

The collapse of Enron Corporation in 2001 remains one of the most infamous examples of corporate governance failure, highlighting the devastating consequences of unethical practices and inadequate oversight. Enron, once a leader in the energy sector, engaged in systemic fraud to manipulate profits and stock prices. Company executives, including CEO Jeffrey Skilling and CFO Andrew Fastow, utilized off-balance-sheet special purpose entities (SPEs) to hide debt and inflate revenue, misleading stakeholders about the company's financial health. Other deceptive practices included channel stuffing, which artificially increased sales figures, and the aggressive use of mark-to-market accounting to record projected earnings as current revenue, creating a false impression of profitability. The root causes of the Enron scandal included a toxic corporate culture that prioritized short-term financial performance over long-term sustainability and ethical conduct. The lack of effective oversight by the board of directors enabled executives to pursue these fraudulent schemes without accountability. Additionally, Enron's reliance on opaque and complex financial practices made it difficult for regulators and investors to detect irregularities (Coates, 2007). These issues were exacerbated by a regulatory framework that, at the time, lacked the robustness to address such sophisticated forms of fraud. In response to the scandal, several mitigation strategies have been identified to prevent similar occurrences. Strengthening board oversight through the inclusion of independent directors with financial expertise is critical. Transparency in financial reporting, particularly around off-balance-sheet transactions, can enhance accountability. Cultivating a culture of ethical leadership and integrity at the executive level is essential to fostering responsible corporate behavior. Furthermore, regulatory reforms such as the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, which introduced stringent requirements for financial reporting and internal controls, have established a precedent for addressing corporate fraud (Coates, 2007). The Enron scandal underscores the importance of ethical practices, transparent reporting, and effective governance in maintaining stakeholder trust and long-term success.

Case Study 2: The Volkswagen Emissions Scandal

The Volkswagen emissions scandal, commonly referred to as "Dieselgate," emerged in 2015 as a significant corporate governance failure. Volkswagen was found to have installed emissions-cheating software in millions of its diesel vehicles, allowing them to pass regulatory tests while emitting pollutants far above legal limits during real-world operation. This scandal highlighted systemic ethical and governance shortcomings within the company, affecting its reputation, financial stability, and stakeholder trust (Jung & Sharon, 2017). Several root causes contributed to this scandal. Volkswagen's corporate culture, driven by a focus on market dominance and profitability, fostered an environment where employees felt pressured to deliver results by any means necessary. Senior management's direct involvement in the fraud and the board of directors' failure to provide adequate oversight enabled the continuation of unethical practices. Additionally, inadequate internal controls prevented the detection and prevention of the emissions-cheating scheme. External pressures, such as stringent emissions regulations, further incentivized unethical behavior as the company sought to meet compliance requirements without making significant technological investments (Jung & Sharon, 2017). Following the scandal, Volkswagen undertook significant reforms to rebuild trust and strengthen its governance framework. The company restructured its board to enhance independence and accountability and committed to increased transparency in its operations. Volkswagen also shifted its strategic focus toward sustainability, including substantial investments in electric vehicles and environmentally friendly practices. These efforts aimed to restore the company's reputation and align its operations with ethical and regulatory standards. To prevent similar incidents in the future, companies must prioritize ethical leadership, robust internal controls, and a governance structure that ensures accountability at all levels (Jung & Sharon, 2017). Both the Enron and

Volkswagen cases serve as cautionary tales, illustrating how the absence of ethical practices and effective governance can lead to catastrophic outcomes. They highlight the importance of fostering a culture of integrity, ensuring transparency in operations, and implementing rigorous oversight mechanisms to maintain stakeholder trust and promote long-term sustainability.

Case Study 3: Samsung and Its Corporate Governance Reforms

Samsung makes for a nice study in how the public interest and governance problems can at least partly drive corporate governance reforms on the other side of Enron and Volkswagen. The South Korean giant has had a troubled history with its family-run corporate governance and pervasiveness in multiple industries. Until now, Samsung governance had been criticized as opaque and concentrated among a small number of officers - notably the Lee family member overseeing affiliates across the portfolio of chaebols. In recent years, Samsung has done much to address these issues, improving its corporate governance structures. It has appointed a slew of newly independent members to its board, reworked the internal controls and adopted more stringent measures for disclosures within its financial statements. These were the reforms, that consisted of more institutionalization and transparency in decision-making processes, such as setting up an audit committee. Likewise, Samsung has been emphasizing the connection between executive compensation and performance metrics, with executives being held accountable for both financial and ethical outcomes (Lee 2020). Through these governance reforms, stakeholder trust has increased while the corporate image of Samsung has seen a positive transformation cementing responsible business practice and ethical leadership as a focus. So even as the control of founding family remains a problem, Samsung finally loosening decades of risk-averse corporate governance practices is indicative that cronyism can be overthrown and governance limbs can be restored through responsive aspirations from responsible stakeholder groups.

Case Study 4: The Unilever and Ethical Governance

A multinational consumer goods company; Unilever, offers a case study in how governance that works well within the realities of corporate life can lead to ethical business promotion and stakeholder trust. For years Unilever has been known for CSR (corporate social responsibility) and sustainability. There is no doubt the company has incorporated moral principles within its corporate governance framework, especially when it comes to environmental conservation, employment policies as well as economic strategy. Unilever believes that the best way to align its corporate governance with responsible investment is through engaging in its Sustainable Living Plan, which aims to cut the environmental footprint of the company and act altruistically. The board of directors of the company is also directly involved in monitoring and overseeing the achievement of these goals along with ensuring that the operations of Unilever are being carried out in line with its CSR responsibilities. And by tying executive compensation to sustainability performance, Unilever is aligning the interest's management with long-term shareholder and societal impact. The principles of Unilever governance framework have built trust among their stakeholders, as it shows how committed they are to ethical business practices and bringing a positive impact on society. This had led to the brand loyalty, increase in employees' happiness and positive constancy with shareholders and customers. The Unilever way illustrates how corporate governance can be used to achieve economic and societal value (Haider, 2019).

Case Study 5: The Tata Group's Governance Principles

Tata group — one of India leading and respected business houses— is one such real-life example of strong value-based corporate governance. The organization has always been recognized for the business ethics, integrity and stakeholder involvement that it practices. Tata's company founding ethos or governance principles as an enterprise is an inspiration from Jamsetji Tata who believed that a business needs to run with a responsibility towards the society. Tata Group has often pioneered a host of governance practices for the benefit of its diverse set of stakeholders. For example, its board is singularly independent and executive pay is linked to the company's long-term health and sustainability. In addition to these, Tata group has also paved the way in corporate social responsibility within India with a huge spend on education, healthcare and rural development. The way company treats with the subject of its governance makes it possible for the company to not only retain the confidence of its stakeholders but also earns an image of credibility which is one generic requirement for development (Bhandari & Jain, 2018). The Tata Group, for example, represents how values-based leadership and ethical governance can contribute to stakeholder confidence. Today, the firm is known for its investments in transparency, accountability and corporate social responsibility that not only strengthens its image but also sustainably nourishes a reputation year after another. These incidents illustrate the different flavors of corporate governance practices which affect stakeholder trust and in turn, organizational survival. If Enron and Volkswagen are the dark side of governance failures, others — Samsung, Unilever and Tata Group — illuminate the bright side by showing how good governance enables stakeholder trust, ethics and longevity. Examples from these experiences underscore the role of transparent governance mechanisms and leadership, ethics and stakeholder engagement, as well as corporate strategies addressing social responsibility. In a complex business landscape, this gives rise to sustainability in businesses where, only with the adoption of better governance practices, trust can be established, and risk mitigation is possible.

9. Comparative Analysis of Case Studies

The cross-case study comparison of global corporate governance practices including Enron, VW, Samsung, Unilever and Tata Group reveals that even though organizations have done a lot to foster mutual stakeholder trust firstly as a means by which they can protect organizational reputation and ultimately ensure long term viability – many geographical areas are at very different places in this journey. These cases illustrate the importance of corporate governance mechanisms while highlighting the consequences of failure there and thus make valuable contributions to practical lessons on governing as well. As an illustration, at Enron, a company that represented in its heyday the culmination of corporate success, governance failures—particularly absence of board oversight, lack of linkage between executive compensation and long-term value creation and use of misleading financial statements—resulted in the firm's demise (Coates 2007). The insular board of directors lacked the checks and balances to oversee senior executives, allowing them to perpetuate dishonest accounting practices. Ultimately these sanctions driven dalliance undermined stakeholder trust, and the resulting financial and reputational losses were not only fortune's arrow but also a systemic blow to broader market and regulatory stability. This underscores the vital need for independent board members who put long-term shareholder value and transparency first. Likewise, Volkswagen struggled with governance issues related to its emissions scandal resulting directly from a culture that emphasized performance at the expense of ethical behavior. In this case, the company appears to have strong governance on paper, but it seems that leadership fails which result in control of emissions data and damaged relation with regulators, consumers and investors (Jung, 2017). In the case of Volkswagen have seen it time and again in corporate including famous cases like Enron, shortcuts taken by top management level and a company culture accepting to cut corners for some dollars are just a recipe for disaster. Plus, the board's failure to hold executives accountable for their actions helped drive the company into crisis. In contrast, Samsung is purposely reinforcing its governance mechanisms after a series of national scandals and leadership crises. The reforms undertaken by the company mostly center on increasing independent directors, enhancing internal reporting process, and reworking executive compensation to align it with long-term value rather than short term profits (Lee 2020). Despite the obstacles that remain, Samsung's initiatives to enhance transparency and foster a more accountable corporate ecosystem represent an answer to the question of how corporations in troubled governance grab their chances for rehabilitation and journey towards restoring stakeholder confidence. For years Unilever remains a textbook company which has given genuine financial return for the business conducted ethically and purposefully with sustainable corporate governance. Alternatively, it could stick to the point that its independent board is but one of a number of governance tools at the company—because those are certainly in place for social and environmental responsibility, as well as for editorial performance. As Haider (2019) explains, Unilever has maintained a positive environment with stakeholders and been able to gain their trust by being clear enough about what they were engaging in, including the CSR and sustainability projects. Moving Forward Unilever´s attempt to align governance with long-term value creation and sustainability as well serve as valuable compass of direction for-profit companies seeking centuries tangled between a natural environmental shield and unconsciousness of social responsibility.

Even Ratan Tata, the head of India's largest conglomerate has emphasized a lot on ethical governance. The Tata board structure, staffed by a mix of independent directors and seasoned professionals at the top, guarantees that when decisions on strategy are made, they will be accompanied by considerations for long-term viability with respect to shareholders and stakeholders as a whole. Tata's Corporate Governance framework is rooted in the values of its founder Jamsetji Tata which has practiced Business Ethics & Transparency and Social Responsibility since inception (Bhandari & Jain, 2018). In fact, this culture of governance has further strengthened stakeholder trust at Tata Group even during the worst times and shows that the values driving an organization can enhance its governance mechanism resulting in a bonding between stakeholders. These case studies provide a few common threads — independent board oversight, long-term oriented executive compensation packages, transparency and corporate culture with ethical dimension. All of these are important to earn and sustain the trust of the stakeholders which is a key driving factor for long-term success and sustainability. Moreover, the different results of these companies illustrate that corporate governance is not a one-size-fits-all proposition and that the means to achieve trust-building entails making certain that the architecture of governance institutionalizes values about ethics and an ongoing commitment to creating sustainable stakeholder value. These case studies demonstrate that corporate governance is not performing to the minimum requirements of legislative compliance or simply pretending to play by having good intentions, rather it is about instilling transparency, ethical leadership and accountability into the DNA of the corporate culture. The principles outlined in this article map directly to an organizations capacity to command the trust of its stakeholders over the long term and as a direct consequence also showcase organizational resilience (Unilever, Tata Group, Samsung etc.) or conversely cause severe reputational harm and ultimate failure (Enron, Volkswagen) These case studies are effective lessons that organizations worldwide can learn from to build better governance practices and enhance stakeholder confidence.

10. Implications for Practice and Policy

Investigations of these and other brokering frameworks must only lead to meaningful conclusions across global case studies if one seeks implications for corporate practice or public policy. Effective corporate governance is critical not only for maintaining stakeholder confidence, but also for companies as clear deliverers of sustainable value, risk mitigation and business sustainability. These results suggest what practitioners, policymakers and regulators can do to improve standards of governance and support ethical business practices. Another key lesson derived from these case studies was the need to strengthen governance mechanisms. The foundations of governance are independent boards of directors, transparent financial disclosure and executive pay tied to long-term corporate goals. These are mechanisms that should be implemented by every company that wishes to provide for accountability and transparency with respect to decision making. Best practices include regular governance audits, board expansion to add outside members, and clear ethical provisions for corporate executives. This aspect is necessary in instilling accountability and integrity that defined this article, and these steps will assist an organization develop into such a culture based on risk of failure governance whereby trust should be an essential among stakeholders Fostered. Another important variable that is relevant to corporate governance and its outcomes is the role of ethical leadership and organizational culture. Ethical leadership with emphasis on ethical values of the firm like in case of Tata Group and Unilever have been able to build stakeholder trust and lasting images of positive reputation. But looking the other way on ethics is extremely risky business for corporations, as past corporate governance failures at Enron and Volkswagen illustrate. For practitioners, this points towards the importance of corporate culture emphasis on being ethical along with transparent decision making and long-term outlook. For ethical leadership to be a part of the core identity of a company it should be integrated in corporate training programs, in its leader development and within its organization policies. For leaders, the numbers game is not enough; they need to produce great performance and an organization that meets its ethical responsibilities toward stakeholders. The second main lesson drawn from the case studies is stakeholder engagement. Companies need to communicate with and build support from all of its stakeholders, not just shareholders, but employees, customers, the entire community at large in order to trust them to do business as best they can. These can include clear communication, listening to voices of stakeholders raising concerns regarding corporate social responsibility (CSR) and the environmental impact. Through corporal stakeholder engagement, companies can avoid conflicts and disruptions, increase transparency, and support long-term sustainability. Stakeholder engagement cannot be confined to financial reporting but should also incorporate wider socio-environmental aspects that affect the corporation's image and activities. The insights gained from the case studies also emphasize that there needs to be a stronger legal framework to improve corporate governance norms. Instead, policymakers should strengthen board independence rules, increase accountability for financial reporting practices and mandate disclosures on executive pay. In addition, regulators need to implement frameworks which would promote responsible corporate behavior via a compulsory signposting of CSR undertakings and ecological effects. Then these regulations need to be enforced strongly so as to deter companies from engaging in malpractices. Policy makers also needs to adapt governance regulations gradually as per the latest business practices and emerging risks, in order to ensure that governance system is keeping pace with new problems. A second and related implication is the need for international collaboration in reforming corporate governance. High-quality corporate governance is globally important due to the interconnected nature of our economies, and we need to share best practice on an international basis. There are instances in which the work of governments and international organizations, including the OECD, can assist with cross-border dialogue on best practices and corporate governance reform. But global collaboration can alleviate transnational issues like corruption and regulatory arbitrage, ensuring companies everywhere are adhering to standardized ethical guidelines and practices. Harmonized governance standards can facilitate responsible business practices worldwide, creating value for businesses and stakeholders alike. And the final thing that some of these case studies seem to indicate is targeting long-term value opposed to short-term profits. The focus on short-term financials in companies like Volkswagen and Enron resulted in catastrophic governance framework which disregarded the principles of sustainable growth. Policymakers and business executives need to turn their attention instead to longer-term strategies that emphasize research-and-development, creativity and environmental responsibility. Fan of the idea that financial regulation should be structured to deter the pursuit of short-term profits at the cost of long duration value creation. Sustainable growth generates the sort of businesses that are more resilient, which is certainly in everyone's interest — companies and policymakers alike. The implications for practice and policy stemming from these global case studies demonstrate the relevance of systemic failures to proper corporate governance, leadership ethics, social responsibility, stakeholder engagement, and short-termism versus long-term orientation. Companies must practice what they preach to hold on to trust and create enduring value by incorporating best practice governance and ethics throughout their organizations. To policymakers and regulators, allowing space for putting transparency, accountability, and corporate responsibility in place will facilitate enterprises with more resilience and sustainability embedded into their business ecosystem. In the end, these steps will result in greater corporate responsibility, economic health, and global corporate trust.

11. Conclusion and Future Research Directions

This study aimed to investigate the role of corporate governance practices and its acts upon stakeholder trust based on multiple global case studies and contribution. The results highlight that strong corporate governance structures — including independent boards, transparency in financial reporting, and alignment of executive compensation — are critical for building trust and accountability in corporations. Central to maintaining trust with the stakeholders and preserving long-term business sustainability, the role of ethical leadership and a healthy corporate culture was identified. Moreover, stakeholder engagement and the need for effective communication among stakeholders materialize as vital issues to develop beneficial relationships for the organization preventing corporate scandals. Through its case studies, including the cases of several best-implemented companies such as Unilever, Tata Group and Volkswagen, in contrast with Enron which faced a total downfall due to corporate governance failure; it clearly indicated the relationship between corporate governance and organization reputation & financial performance. The importance of governance in good economic and social performance was apparent; whereas strong governance structures consolidate transparency and accountability, lapses in governance often lead to heavy financial, legal, and reputational losses. Hence, companies and regulators should appreciate the need for upgrading governance practices for sustainability and risk mitigation in a more convoluted business ecosystem.

Although this study sheds light on aspects of corporate governance, further research is needed in a few areas. The paper invites further research regarding changes in the role of technology, for example AI and blockchain, in strengthening governance policy-making and increasing the transparency of decision processes. These technologies promise to enable efficient monitoring, reporting and decision-making that may bolster corporate governance frameworks even further. Examining how these technologies could be incorporated in governance would give a clearer picture of their possible role in changing corporate forms and functions. More comparative and interpretive studies are needed to understand the influence of particular cultural, economic, and regulatory contexts on corporate governance practices. Our research was mainly concerned with global published case studies, mostly in developed markets; the governance role in emerging markets and developing economies such as Africa and Southeast Asia remains to be studied. These findings would provide further information about the global governance standards by understanding how practices are adapted locally and what organizations must deal with in these areas. In addition, the future studies can study on corporate governance and CSR. This study also mentioned the link between CSR and trust, but a future analysis could investigate whether CSR initiatives taken in the organization have been ingested into their governance frameworks along with CSR practices adopted to understand how stakeholders perceive them. Companies aiming at balancing shareholder value with social and environmental responsibility would need to view governance and CSR through the lens of synergies between the two. Lastly, the paper recommends that national level policy reforms should be continued as well as reforms to innovate international standards. Governance failures but future studies might examine whether current regulatory systems (e.g., Sarbanes–Oxley Act within the United States) go far enough for governance problems of similarly large firms. Researchers might identify the need to revisit these regulations in light of new challenges like those related to environmental sustainability, social justice and technological innovation. The ever-changing nature of global business practices calls for a corresponding evolution of the regulatory environment, and additional study is needed to ensure governance measures keep pace with the times. Ultimately, corporate governance fosters stakeholder confidence and is a prerequisite for sustainability and risk management in business. However, the lessons this study generates can be valuable for corporate practices as well as public policy, and guide organizations that are interested in improving their governance framework. Now, as the world continues to evolve and transform, so too must governance in order to meet new challenges, exploit new opportunities and also most importantly remain fit for purpose in delivering transparency, accountability and ultimately sustainability of businesses. Research into technology integration, cultural diversity, CSR, and regulatory reform will allow us to learn how corporate governance can further sustain or improve stakeholder trust and the rise in global sustainable business practices.

References

Abor, J., & Fiador, V. (2020). Does corporate governance explain corporate performance in Sub-Saharan Africa? *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics, 15*(3), 261–275. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBGE.2020.10034431

Adams, R. B., & Ferreira, D. (2009). Women in the boardroom and their impact on governance and performance. *Journal of Financial Economics, 94(2)*, 291–309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2008.10.007

Aguilera, R. V., Judge, W. Q., & Terjesen, S. A. (2015). Corporate governance deviance. *Academy of Management Annals, 9*(1), 315–395. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2015.1024503

Banerjee, S., Bose, S., & Hussain, M. (2020). Corporate governance failures: Lessons from the Satyam scandal. *Journal of Business Ethics, 161*(2), 371–391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04279-7

Bebchuk, L. A. (2007). The case for shareholder access to the ballot. *Harvard Law Review, 117(3),* 649–726.

Bebchuk, L. A., & Fried, J. M. (2004). Pay without performance: The unfulfilled promise of executive compensation. *Harvard University Press.*

Bebchuk, L. A., Brav, A., & Jiang, W. (2015). The long-term effects of hedge fund activism. *Columbia Law Review, 115(5)*, 1085–1156.

Bhagat, S., & Bolton, B. (2019). Corporate governance and firm performance: The sequel. *Journal of Corporate Finance, 58*, 142–168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2019.04.006

Bhagat, S., & Bolton, B. (2019). Corporate governance and firm performance: The sequel. *Journal of Corporate Finance, 58*, 142–168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2019.04.006

Bhandari, M., & Jain, P. (2018). Corporate governance in the Indian context: A case study of the Tata Group. *International Journal of Corporate Governance, 9(2*), 143-159.

Bhimani, A., Laker, B., & Foy, N. (2021). Blockchain technology in corporate governance: Evidence from supply chain applications. *Journal of Corporate Finance, 66*, 101914. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2020.101914

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6),* 595–616. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004

Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society, 38*(3), 268–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039903800303

Carter, D. A., Simkins, B. J., & Simpson, W. G. (2010). Corporate governance, board diversity, and firm value. *Financial Review, 45(2*), 267–292.

Chapple, W., Moon, J., & Slager, R. (2019). Varieties of corporate social responsibility approaches and impacts in emerging economies. *Business & Society, 58*(6), 1213–1246. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650316683833

Claessens, S., & Yurtoglu, B. B. (2013). Corporate governance in emerging markets: A survey. *Emerging Markets Review, 15*, 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ememar.2012.03.002

Coates, J. C. (2007). The goals and promise of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 21*(1), 91-116. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.21.1.91

Cordeiro, J. J., Ferreira, D., & Viegas, M. (2020). The role of executive compensation in shaping corporate sustainability performance: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Business Ethics, 162(4),* 669–687. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04231-7

Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management Review, 22(1),* 20–47.

Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science, 60(11)*, 2835–2857.

Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2020). ESG matters: The performance of sustainable companies. *Journal of Finance, 75*(1), 33–56. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12884

Edmans, A. (2020). The shareholder value myth: How putting shareholders first harms investors, corporations, and the public. *Harvard Business Press.*
Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. *Journal of Law and Economics, 26(2)*, 301–325.
Fan, J. P. H., Wei, K. C. J., & Xu, X. (2011). Corporate finance and governance in emerging markets: A selective review and an agenda for future research*. Journal of Corporate Finance, 17(2)*, 207–214.
Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach.* Cambridge University Press.
Freeman, R. E., Phillips, R. A., & Sisodia, R. (2020). Tensions in stakeholder theory. *Business & Society, 59*(2), 213–231. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650318773750
Gillan, S. L. (2006). Corporate governance and shareholder activism. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance, 18(1)*, 55–65.
Haider, Z. (2019). Unilever's corporate governance and its CSR initiatives. *Journal of Business Ethics, 145(1)*, 103-115.
Healy, P. M., & Palepu, K. G. (2001). Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure, and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 31*(1–3), 405–440. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-4101(01)00018-0
Hillman, A. J., & Dalziel, T. (2003). Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives. *Academy of Management Review, 28*(3), 383–396. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2003.10196729
Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs, and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4)*, 305–360.
Jung, C. (2017). Corporate governance at Volkswagen: A case study*. Journal of Business Ethics, 141(2*), 235-249. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3069-3
Jung, J., & Sharon, J. (2017). Governance failures and their consequences: The case of Volkswagen's Dieselgate. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 26*(3), 256–269. https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12147
Kaplan, S. N. (2013). Executive compensation and corporate governance in the US: Perceptions, reality, and reform. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 27(3),* 103–124.
Kaptein, M. (2011). From inaction to action: The influence of corporate social responsibility on stakeholder trust. *Journal of Business Ethics, 99(2)*, 405–417. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0676-2
Karpoff, J. M. (2001). The impact of shareholder activism on corporate performance*. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 36(3)*, 457–478.
Kim, H., Patten, D. M., & Jo, H. (2021). Corporate governance and stakeholder trust: Comparative evidence from developed and emerging markets. *Corporate Governance: An International Review, 29*(1), 78–92. https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12357
Kochhar, R. (1997). The effect of corporate governance and top management compensation on firm performance: A comparative analysis of the US and Japan. *Strategic Management Journal, 18(1),* 17–41.
Lee, S. (2020). Samsung's corporate governance reform: A critical analysis*. Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 37(4),* 1229-1248. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-019-09854-5
Mallin, C. A. (2019). Corporate governance (6th ed.). Oxford University Press.
McKinsey & Company. (2019). The rise of ESG and the role of shareholder activism. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com
Mishra, C. S., & Nielsen, S. L. (2000). Corporate governance and organizational performance: A study of shareholder value in the global market. *International Journal of Business and Society, 1(2)*, 135–151.
OECD. (2015). G20/OECD principles of corporate governance*. OECD Publishing.*
Pirson, M., Martin, K., & Parmar, B. (2016). Public trust in business and its determinants. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 26*(3), 293–326. https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2016.34

Post, C., & Byron, K. (2015). Women on boards and firm financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Corporate Governance: An International Review, 23(5)*, 404–423.

Schoeman, C., & Sandrock, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence in corporate governance: Opportunities and challenges. *Sustainability, 14*(3), 1175. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031175

Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. *The Journal of Finance, 52(2)*, 737–783.

Sullivan, R., & Mackenzie, C. (2017). Responsible investment: Principles and practices. *Socially Responsible Investment, 3*(1), 14–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2017.1377225

Sullivan, R., & Mackenzie, C. (2020). ESG and trust-building in corporate governance. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal, 11*(4), 675–692. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-03-2019-0108

Turnbull, S., & Wass, V. (2018). Governance challenges in emerging markets: The role of stakeholder trust. *International Business Review, 27*(5), 962–974. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2018.01.005

Wamba, S. F., Akter, S., Edwards, A., & Chopin, G. (2021). Big data analytics and transparency in corporate governance. *Decision Support Systems, 146*, 113592. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2021.113592

Zahra, S. A., & Pearce, J. A. (1989). Boards of directors and corporate financial performance: A review and integrative model. *Journal of Management, 15(2),* 291–334.

Published by